

Rob Zuccaro

From: Rob Zuccaro
Sent: Thursday, June 25, 2020 3:09 PM
To: 'stevebrauneis@hotmail.com'; 'Jeff Moline'; 'Thomas Rice'; 'Dietrich Hoefner'; Ben Diehl; '(null) (null)'; 'Debra Williams'
Cc: Lisa Ritchie
Subject: RE: June 25 Packet Supplement No. 3 - Redtail Ridge GDP/Comp Plan Amendments
Attachments: Combined through 6.25 3pm.pdf

Chair Brauneis and Members of the Commission:

Please find attached public comments on the Redtail Ridge GDP and Comp Plan amendment requests that staff received through 3pm today. This will likely be the last supplement sent to the Commission for tonight's meeting.

Thank You,

Rob Zuccaro

Rob Zuccaro, AICP
Planning and Building Safety Director
City of Louisville
303-335-4590

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Redtail Ridge

-----Original Message-----

From: Jacqui Baker [mailto:jacqui26@gmail.com]

Sent: Thursday, June 25, 2020 10:03 AM

To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>

Subject: Redtail Ridge

To whom it may concern:

My name is Jacqui Leggett and I am a constituent of Louisville, CO. I wanted to express some concern for the possible development at the StorageTek site.

Please consider telling the developer that their proposal is much too big. They should come back with a plan the size of what was approved for ConocoPhillips, which is already a generous 60% bigger than StorageTek. I urge you to vote "no" on the development plan and PUD on the agenda.

Also, I urge you to vote that the developer does not meet the criteria for a comprehensive plan change. The developer must meet every one of the four criteria (as cited in Sec. 17.64.070) for you to be able to vote yes. The developer can already build up to three million square feet under current "Rural" designation, so a comprehensive plan change is not needed. That's twice the size of the current StorageTek facility and much bigger than ConocoPhillips 2.4 million square feet. Medtronic can easily fit into that space with lots of room left over for office and retail.

Lastly, Louisville does not need 900 more multi-family rental units which are essentially out of town, increasing rental units to about 45% of Louisville's housing stock and will make the city actually lose tax base.

I urge to consider these points as you review the Redtail Ridge proposal.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Jacqui Leggett

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Public Comments for tonight's meeting 6/25/20 on Redtail Ridge and Medtronics

From: cindy Bedell [<mailto:cyndilarson@yahoo.com>]

Sent: Thursday, June 25, 2020 11:47 AM

To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>

Cc: electmattjones@gmail.com

Subject: Public Comments for tonight's meeting 6/25/20 on Redtail Ridge and Medtronics

6/25/20

Dear City of Louisville Planning Commission,

First of all, thanks for donating your time in service of the community. I'm sure you each believe in what you are doing and take your responsibility to help shape the future of Louisville very seriously.

Tonight you will make a decision on the Redtail Ridge application and the Medtronics PUD.

I have said this before, and I will say it again: Please vote no on this application. Tell the applicant that this proposal is too high density, the scale does not fit the vision of small town Louisville crafted into our Comp Plans for many years, and that the citizens want more wildlife conservation open space. Let's be creative and find a way to have a balanced, sustainable project! The Mayhoffer open space was purchased through a cooperative agreement with Louisville, Lafayette, and Boulder County. Approve a realistic PUD for Medtronics and save some land for the wildlife, as a buffer between Broomfield and Louisville, and to preserve our SE gateway viewsheds. I know this is idealistic, but the future of our town is too important not to have a creative, sustainable vision.

Please also consider that the traffic projections for this massive project are hideous. I understand that Superior is considering a large scale project at the Zaharias property across the highway that would add to the traffic problems. Shouldn't we be thinking regionally? Can each municipality keep putting in massive developments that increase traffic on Highway 36 with no concern for our neighbors and the regional capacity of our infrastructure?

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Cindy Bedell

662 W. Willow Street

Louisville, CO 80027

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Red Tail Ridge

-----Original Message-----

From: Terry Bierwiler [mailto:terry581@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, June 25, 2020 10:04 AM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Red Tail Ridge

Please add my name to long time residents who do not agree with and do not want the high occupancy Red Tail Ridge development you are reviewing.

I have lived here over 30 years and have seen traffic and congestion increase way to much just in the past 5 to 8 years. This development will increase congestion at the high school and hospitals area where I work.

I've been told that it could increase Louisville's population by almost 25% during weekdays! Louisville is still trying to moderate additional problems from other developments such as 95/SBR. Traffic on 95th is terrible during rush hours (even prior to the construction) and it was never that bad before.

Please do not approve this huge development plan.

Terry Bierwiler
198 Juniper Street
Louisville

Sent from my iPhone

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Redtail Ridge

-4596

From: Larry Cappel, M.A. LMFT [<mailto:openmindtherapy@gmail.com>]

Sent: Thursday, June 25, 2020 7:07 AM

To: Planning <planning@Louisvilleco.gov>

Subject: Redtail Ridge

Please do not approve this project. It is too big and too destructive. Find new ways to pay the bills. Don't sell our last piece of open space to the developers. Here is something I posted in Next Door this morning regarding this project. I want you to seriously consider it:

"Planning committee members and city counsel members are there for their careers. They get elected, they approve projects, they leave city counsel guaranteed a good high paying job with these developers and their friends. Between this fact and the fact that our model for funding government is designed on an archaic idea that we can build and grow forever, means they will always approve these things unless the backlash is loud and strong! All of you! Take what you've written here and make sure the planning commission and city counsel hear this. Tell them NO! Tell them it's time we come up with a 21st century way to pay the city's bills. Resources are finite. We can't use development to pay the bills any more. That land should be open space for all wildlife, human and otherwise."

In summary: Turn it into a large open space. Put a small amount of retail next to Northwest Parkway to create a buffer from that road to the land behind it. Don't develop commercial property along 88th Street. We need more strip malls and big box stores like we need more holes in our heads. Look at all the empty space all over town. Covid is making retail obsolete. Don't build it. If you don't want to develop that land into open space, deed it to Boulder's open space mountain parks and let them do it. They do a good job of managing land for the future. Louisville doesn't seem to have a vision for the future. Greedy now, suffer later seems to be the motto.

Larry Cappel
303-523-6123

--

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: No on Redtail Ridge

-----Original Message-----

From: Barbara Carlough [mailto:brc621@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, June 25, 2020 12:41 PM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: No on Redtail Ridge

Please accept my input on "No on Redtail Ridge"

While I support Medtronic in acquiring this space to expand, I do not support the structure of 5 stories over the limit of 3 stories.

I'm concerned about the amount of people this will bring to Louisville proper - it may be Friday Night StreetFaire all the time. Not to mention the traffic.

As far as it being sold as a positive buildout for Louisville, the traffic and people are a big concern of mine. The video shows the concern and attention to open space, how can it be really with 5.8 million square feet! I think that's the number.

And added retail to the area - better be shops and grocery stores and restaurants so that not everyone is coming to old town Louisville.

I am deeply troubled by what will happen to the prairie dogs - as I know there is not a plan to save them - and that poisoning is an option that is truly not an option in my mind.

The video touts open trails and open space, however, I don't see how that will be a benefit to those of us who live in Louisville proper. I won't drive up there to access their trails. It may be a benefit for those who live there so they don't overcrowd open space that is already too crowded at times.

The senior accommodates are overly priced. Seniors can't afford that kind of living "opportunity".

NO TO REDTAIL RIDGE!
Barbara Carlough

Sent from my iPad

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Redtail Ridge

From: Weiyan Chen [<mailto:weiyanch@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Thursday, June 25, 2020 10:21 AM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Redtail Ridge

I am writing this letter to ask you to vote 'No' for the Redtail Ridge development.

Louisville is the best small town in the country. We, residents of Louisville, chose to live here because we enjoy the small town. We want to keep the small town's character that will be changed by this project. This project is too big for Louisville.

Such big changes should be heard by the residents of Louisville in person, not virtual meeting. It is not very clear what are the pandemics' economic impacts. This is not good time to make such big decision.

Such big project will impact Louisville ecosystem, health care, water, schools, senior and recreation centers, library and other facilities or resources. Louisville is not ready for it.

Thank you

Weiyan Chen

146 Cherrywood Lane

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Please vote no

-----Original Message-----

From: Bartley Cox [mailto:bartleycox@me.com]

Sent: Thursday, June 25, 2020 10:41 AM

To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>

Subject: Please vote no

The StorageTek, ConocoPhillips site should not allow for such a monstrosity. At a minimum, any plan should create beauty, improve our town's tax base, and definitely not create an apartment zone prone to blight in future years. Progress, yes; a strain on our city, no thank you.

Bartley Cox

Ward 3

80027

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Redtail Ridge development

From: Debbie davies [<mailto:debdavies47@msn.com>]
Sent: Thursday, June 25, 2020 11:45 AM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Redtail Ridge development

Dear Planning Commission,
I listened to the entire 4 hour presentation by Brue Baukol to the Planning Commission a couple of weeks ago.

Near the end, they said that they could not abide by the stipulations that the planning commission wanted in reference to actually building retail etc. hand in hand with the housing that is going up. That is a red flag to me. Louisville has been skunked by other developments(Steel Ranch) that promised retail.

I was also not impressed that on land zoned rural, with a maximum build of 3 million square feet, that they decreased the footprint from 6 million to 5 million square feet. They did not make a compelling argument for changing the designation from rural to suburban, except for needing a lot of infrastructure to support the development. Fitting in to the surrounding Broomfield area is not what I want this part of Louisville to look like. It should be in step with the rest of Louisville, with our livable, small town feel, and other than the Medtronic campus, the rest of the development is too big. It should remain rural. The City's Comprehensive plan change requirements have not been met on a number of fronts.

Comprehensive plan change requirements

"Sec. 17.64.070. - Criteria for amendment.

Before an amendment to the comprehensive plan may be adopted, it must be demonstrated that each of the following criteria have been met or are not applicable in order to approve the amendment:

- A. The amendment request is consistent with the goals, policies and intent of the comprehensive plan of the city;
- B. The amendment request will not result in adverse impacts to existing or planned services to the citizens of the city;
- C. The amendment request demonstrates a need exists for the amendment through either changed conditions or past error which support adjustments to the city's comprehensive plan;
- D. The planning commission and/or city council may consider other factors in reviewing an application as they deem appropriate and may request additional information which is necessary for an adequate review and evaluation of the amendment."

This is from Matt Jones, and I agree completely with these comments, related to criterion A above.

"A Sense of Community . . . where residents, property owners, business owners, and visitors feel a connection to Louisville and to each other, and where the City's character, physical form and accessible government contribute to a citizenry that is actively involved in the decision-making process to meet their individual and collective needs.

Our Livable Small Town Feel . . . where the City's size, scale, and land use mixture and government's high-quality customer service encourage personal and commercial interactions. A Healthy, Vibrant, and Sustainable Economy . . . where the City understands and appreciates the trust our residents, property owners, and business owners place in it when they invest in Louisville, and where the City is committed to a strong and supportive business climate which fosters a healthy and vibrant local and regional economy for today and for the future.

Sustainable Practices for the Economy, Community, and the Environment . . . where we challenge our government, residents, property owners, and our business owners to be innovative with sustainable practices so the needs of today are met without compromising the needs of future generations. Unique

Balanced Transportation System . . . where the City desires to make motorists, transit customers, bicyclists and pedestrians of all ages and abilities partners in mobility, and where the City intends to create and maintain a multimodal transportation system to ensure that each user can move in ways that contribute to the economic prosperity, public health, and exceptional quality of life in the City.

Integrated Open Space and Trail Networks . . . where the City appreciates, manages and preserves the natural environment for community benefit, including its ecological diversity, its outstanding views, clear-cut boundaries, and the interconnected, integrated trail network which makes all parts of the City accessible.

Ecological Diversity . . . where the City, through its management of parks and open space and its development and landscape regulations, promotes biodiversity by ensuring a healthy and resilient natural environment, robust plant life and diverse habitats.

Open, Efficient and Fiscally Responsible Government . . . where the City government is approachable, transparent, and ethical, and our management of fiscal resources is accountable, trustworthy, and prudent."

Sustainability issues were not addressed at all in their proposal. This is very important to me as a 30 year resident of Louisville. Ecological issues were not touched on, really, except in the report(below), and to say there would be 60 acres of open space/park land.

Per the Biological and Cultural Assessment provided by CTL | Thompson, Inc. (CTL), wildlife will most likely be deeply affected by this developer's proposal.

"Due to the timing of the Site visit, it is unclear if burrowing owls may be present on the Site during the spring and summer months. If development of the Site is planned between March 15 and October 31, we recommend a burrowing owl survey to ensure the owls are not nesting in the on-Site prairie dog burrows. The majority of the Site presents suitable tree-nesting and ground-nesting habitat for migratory bird species, including bald eagles and golden eagles. Additionally, we observed a great horned owl nest and two other potential raptor nests on the Site. For a higher level of assurance and to avoid destruction of ground-nesting migratory bird nests, vegetation should be removed outside of the breeding season (March to August). "

It is a bit ironic to call it Redtail Ridge when there will be no more redtail hawks since their habitat, including prairie dogs, will be completely destroyed. This area should be developed as a rural property to maintain as much ecological and biological diversity as possible. Once it is gone, we will never get it back. It is disturbing to me that the 'fix' is to avoid construction during migratory bird and burrowing owl breeding season, as there are fewer and fewer places in Colorado for these birds to breed in the following season. If all municipalities take on this view of displacement, eventually there won't be any wildlife left to displace.

I think we need more multi-unit housing in town, however, not to the tune of 2.5 million square feet, and over 2000 units. It's overwhelming. The Density Analysis document compares Redtail Ridge to Broomfield and Superior developments, not to Louisville developments, which are not as massive in scope.

The Medtronic piece would be wonderful, and 5 stories for them would be ok.

Please vote no on this particular proposal.

Thank you,

Deborah Davies

603 W. Aspen Ct

Louisville

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: ConocoPhillips Development

From: Linda Du [<mailto:4lindadu@gmail.com>]
Sent: Thursday, June 25, 2020 11:51 AM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: ConocoPhillips Development

Hi, Planning Commission,

As residents of Louisville, My husband and I love our town very much. We understand our town needs some development, however, we strongly vote "NO" for the current plan for ConocoPhillips Development.

1. The developer's proposal is too big, they should come back with the a plan the size of what was approved for ConocoPhillips which is already a generous 60% bigger which is already a generous 60% bigger that Storage Tek, and to vote no on the development plan and PUD on the agenda.the developer does not meet the criteria for a comprehensive plan change.
2. The developer **must meet every one of the four criteria (listed below) for the Planning Commission to be able to vote yes.** (From my read, they can't meet any of the criteria.) The developer can already build up to three million square feet under the current "Rural" designation, so a comprehensive plan change is not needed. That's twice the size of StorageTek and much bigger that Conoco Phillips 2.4 million square feet. Medtronic can easily fit into that space with lots of room left over for office and retail. Louisville does not need 900 more multi-family rental units which are essentially out of town, will increase rental units to about 45% of Louisville's housing stock and will make the city

Zhong Chao Wu and Linda Du
696 Club Cir.
Louisville, CO 80027

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Vote no to Redtail Ridge development plan

-----Original Message-----

From: Grace Gee [mailto:grace@gracegeeeart.com]

Sent: Wednesday, June 24, 2020 11:10 PM

To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>

Subject: Vote no to Redtail Ridge development plan

Dear Planning Commission,

I am writing in strong opposition to the Redtail Ridge development. This Redtail Ridge plan is significantly larger than what was approved for ConocoPhillips, which was already 60 percent bigger than that of Storage Tek. The developer does not meet the criteria for a comprehensive plan change and Louisville does not need 900 more multi-family rental units. The Redtail Ridge plan is far too large. Please vote "no" on the development plan and PUD on the agenda.

Thank you,

Grace Gee

Ward 1

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Redtail Ridge

From: ma heaney [<mailto:ohsm@earthlink.net>]

Sent: Thursday, June 25, 2020 9:26 AM

To: Planning <planning@Louisvilleco.gov>

Subject: Redtail Ridge

Please REJECT the development plan for the Conoco Phillips property as submitted.

The project is FAR too large. At least one third of that property should be preserved as open space and left undeveloped. When so many other municipalities are trying to reclaim open land and green space for citizens - at great expense - why would Louisville willing dispose of our last opportunity to preserve a significant parcel of open land? Retain the Rural zoning designation.

The project does not meet the goals, or intent, of numerous plans developed over years by citizens: Master Plan, PROST, and Sustainability Action Plan. Louisville should not alter its long-range, carefully developed plans to the detriment of citizens.

The development will create far too much traffic. Especially when the increase in traffic from planned Broomfield developments in that area is considered.

Environmentally, the development is old school; there are no references what so ever to sustainability. In plans submitted to date, there are large seas of heat producing, groundwater recharge preventing asphalt. Where are minimal foot print garages or solar panels covering parking areas? Where are features that direct rainwater runoff to trees in or near pavement? A request for even fewer oxygen producing, carbon-reducing trees than is required has been made by the very first contractor. Where is the solar energy for buildings? Where are built environment designs that reduce energy consumption: passive measures (such as thermal insulation and sun shading) and active measures (such as heat pumps and photovoltaic panels)? And, shockingly, in looking at past development driven by the investment company, there is absolutely no mention of sustainability and no energy saving features to be found. (One high-density housing project did indicate that energy saving appliance *might* be available to owners.)

Last, looking to the future, the development is not financially viable. With a built environment that does not even meet today's standards for energy efficiency (any realtor will tell you that, currently, the number one feature buyers look for in a home is energy efficiency - also true of commercial development), how will this development fare with tenants in 10 years when climate change has an even great impact? Or in 20 years when climate is even more extreme? Tenants will be looking for even more energy efficient features and, not finding them in Louisville properties, bypass us for cleaner, more efficient properties in other cities. Then what will Louisville have? Vacant, undesirable properties that do not generate tax revenue.

Please, vote NO! We all want to see this parcel developed. But not like this. Do not allow investors to dictate Louisville's growth and development. Adhere to our plans in place.

Mary Ann Heaney
[1117 La Farge Ave.](#)

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Stop redbtail ridge development

-----Original Message-----

From: Talitia Hockeborn [mailto:talitia@tejcoaccounting.com]
Sent: Thursday, June 25, 2020 8:52 AM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Stop redbtail ridge development

We live in a great town with a small town feel and we need to keep it

1) Tell the developer that their proposal is way, way too big. The developer should come back with a plan the size of what was approved for ConocoPhillips, which is already a generous 60% bigger than Storage Tek, and to vote no on the development plan and PUD on the agenda.

2) Vote that the developer does not meet the criteria for a comprehensive plan change. The developer must meet every one of the four criteria (listed below) for the Planning Commission to be able to vote yes. (From my read, they can't meet any of the criteria.) The developer can already build up to three million square feet under the current "Rural" designation, so a comprehensive plan change is not needed. That's twice the size of StorageTek and much bigger than Conoco Phillips 2.4 million square feet. Medtronic can easily fit into that space with lots of room left over for office and retail.

3) Tell them that Louisville does not need 900 more multi-family rental units which are essentially out of town, will increase rental units to about 45% of Louisville's housing stock and will make the city actually lose tax income.

Sincerely,
Talitia Hockeborn
Over 21 years homeowner in Louisville.

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Current development plan application for Redtail Ridge

From: Ross Holland [<mailto:rossholland027@gmail.com>]
Sent: Thursday, June 25, 2020 11:10 AM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Current development plan application for Redtail Ridge

Dear Planning Committee members,

I wish to lodge my objection to the proposed current Redtail Ridge development application as being far to large and out of character for the Louisville area.

Dr Ross Holland
397 Caledonia Street,
Louisville CO 8,0027

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Redtail Project

From: Tracey Johnston [<mailto:tjohnston67@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, June 24, 2020 11:05 PM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Redtail Project

To the members of the Planning Commission,

I am writing to voice my opposition to the oversized development of the Red Tail Ridge proposal. As a resident of Louisville for the past 13 years and a teacher in Louisville for the last 21 years, I value our small town with its abundant open space and wildlife. This development is too big and it worries me that so much will be developed, traffic will increase around 88th and Campus drive and there will be little land left over for the wildlife that currently occupies the site. I am also questioning the need for five-story buildings. Our limits in Louisville are three-story for good reasons. Why should this development go around what we have already determined desirable in our small town? Finally, having worked at Monarch for many years, traffic congestion is already difficult near the hospital and the schools. This development would create more traffic, noise, and danger near our schools. This proposal needs to go back to the drawing board and become something our small town can live with. Thank you for considering my opinion

Sincerely,

Tracey Johnston

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Redtail Ridge comments

From: Matt Jones [<mailto:jonesmk123@gmail.com>]

Sent: Thursday, June 25, 2020 10:26 AM

To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>

Subject: Redtail Ridge comments

Summary - Please vote no on the Redtail Ridge Development Plan and PUD and give the applicant guidance that their proposal is way, way too big, quit wasting time and to come back with a proposal sized similar to ConocoPhillips 2.5 million square feet.

The developer talks about how they listened to the community and their proposal is in character with Louisville. It is not! The developer is playing an extreme game of positional bargaining at six million and now five million square feet. If the city played the same game, it would say the development needs to be under one million square feet. Had they really taken public comments to heart, they would be proposing under the three million square feet which the comprehensive plan "Rural" designation now allows—no need for a change. Medtronic and Erickson's buildings would easily fit in three million square feet, with lots of room to spare for more office and retail.

Does anyone really believe that the developer can not make a lot of money and finance the project at under three million square feet? They have not demonstrated the need of something that big though the release of their pro-forma or other financial analysis, they just say they can't. And by not proposing of a reasonable size after hearing from the public, they are slowing down the approval process. Please, in your role as the Louisville public's voice, tell the developer "no" right now, and come back with something the scale of ConocoPhillips so they don't drag this process out even further.

Boulder County - Boulder County does not support this proposal because of the regional negative impacts to this overly large project. The referral letter was sent to the city and should be in the record.

Comprehensive plan change criteria - As a planning commissioner, you are legally obligated to apply the comprehensive plan change criteria. The developer has the responsibility to demonstrate that they meet **each** of the four comprehensive plan criteria. In other words, **not demonstrating they meet any one criterion disqualifies** them from a comprehensive plan change. Reading in the city code introductory sentence closely, with these criteria there is no "balancing" test. They can't "kind of" meet the criteria. So any criteria, including any subsets, must be met.

And it is clear they meet none of the criteria. Included below is the introduction and criteria for a comprehensive plan change, followed in Bold why they do not meet them.

"Before an amendment to the comprehensive plan may be adopted, it must be demonstrated that each of the following criteria have been met or are not applicable in order to approve the amendment:

Sec. 17.64.070. Amendment Criterion A: The amendment request is consistent with the goals, policies and intent of the comprehensive plan of the city" **(For Amendment Criterion A listed below are some of the comprehensive plan values that express comprehensive plan intent, followed by a reply.)**

"We Value... A Sense of Community . . . where residents, property owners, business owners, and visitors feel a connection to Louisville and to each other, and where the City's character, physical form and accessible government contribute to a citizenry that is actively involved in the decision-making process to meet their individual and collective needs."

This development, with about a 25% increase of residential units, would essentially create a second city, that is not well connected to Louisville. It would permanently alter the city's character and its physical form at five million square feet and an increase in rental residential by about 45%. (Note: The planning department estimates there are around 8,500 housing units in Louisville. The 2019 census says 70% of Louisville housing units are owner occupied, leaving 30% that are not. So about 2,550 housing units are not owner occupied, so they rent. The Redtail Ridge proposal adds 2,200 rental units. While the math is not exact, it makes the point of the large and out-of-character scale of the change.)

"Our Livable Small Town Feel...where the City's high-quality customer service complements its size, scale, and land use mixture to encourage personal and commercial interactions."

Livable Small Town Feel cannot be met by tripling the size of the development from what StorageTek was allowed and adding about 25% new residential units to the city, pushing rental units from about 25% to about 45% of the city stock, clearly violates this criteria.

In Louisville even the slogan on the side of police cruisers convey how important this criterion is: "Safety--Quality of Life--Community." Clearly the proposed scale is out of character with our community.

Sustainable Practices for the Economy, Community, and the Environment . . . where the City challenges our government, residents, property owners, and our business owners to be innovative with sustainable practices so that the needs of today are met without compromising the needs of future generations.

This fails thrice. Environment - It would 60% to current traffic creating ozone and climate changing pollution. The massive buildings would add more carbon pollution. And while it leaves some open space, it is a fraction of what StrageTek had. Community – The scale is so massive that it changes Louisville resident's quality of life through traffic, downtown crowding and loss of cohesive community. Economy – It undermines the sustainability of the general fund and open space funds in perpetuity.

Sec. 17.64.070. Amendment Criterion B: The amendment request will not result in adverse impacts to existing or planned services to the citizens of the city;

The development would negatively impact the city general and open space funds in perpetuity. Any up-front, short-term, gain would be swamped out through time. It will create maintenance obligations to the city for roads, drinking and wastewater treatment, and other infrastructure in perpetuity. And do you really believe the development will pay all the up-front infrastructure costs? The developer has provided little in financial analysis to prove its assertions that we should not worry, they have this covered.

Sec. 17.64.070. Amendment Criterion C: The amendment request demonstrates a need exists for the amendment through either changed conditions or past error which support adjustments to the city's comprehensive plan;

This fails both points. Because an "or" is used, the developer must prove both. The property has not changed since the ConocoPhillips development was approved. The passage of time does not change the physical condition and the prime location of the land. There was no past error to approve ConocoPhillips by a previous Planning Commission and City Council. The planning process met all the requirements and has not been challenged.

Sec. 17.64.070. Amendment Criterion D: The planning commission and/or city council may consider other factors in reviewing an application as they deem appropriate and may request additional information which is necessary for an adequate review and evaluation of the amendment.

Public opinion - Most people in town want something built at the StorageTek site, but when they realize how large the proposal is, they typically are opposed. Most public comment is opposed and is grassroots. Supporters who comment frequently have a financial interest or have been engaged as a result of a well-connected PR firm putting their spin on the project.

No proof - The developer has not demonstrated that they can't make the project work at the three million square feet allowed in the "Rural" comprehensive plan designation. No proforma, no in-depth analysis, no disclosure has been provided. Only "trust me" statements that it won't work. Does anyone believe that that the developer can't make a lot of money and pay for improvements at three million square feet? That is double the size of StrageTek and a half million square feet more than Conoco-Phillips. Medtronic and Erickson Living could easily fit in that footprint, with lots of commercial and retail space to spare. They need to prove their assertions, and they have not.

Residential - The developer has not proven why they need the 900 rental units that put a drain on city finances and will likely be built before much of the commercial and retail.

In conclusion, any neutral analysis proves that they cannot meet the criteria, and I think they repeatedly fail all four. Keep the "Rural" comprehensive plan designation. Tell the developer no and to quickly submit a proposal that fits the generous three million square feet allowed under "Rural."

--

Thanks,
Matt Jones
Louisville resident

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Red Tail Ridge

-----Original Message-----

From: E Kaufman [mailto:e3d.kaufman@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, June 25, 2020 7:46 AM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Red Tail Ridge

Hello,

I'm in favor of this project. There is a lot of opposition on social media and I'm sure you'll get a boatload tonight. These people are delusional. Many say they want big box stores, then in the next sentence say they'd rather spend their money in Superior or Lafayette. This is precisely why Kohl's left. They clearly want more retail but won't be spending their dollars at said retail. Please go forward with this project. There are several good arguments for going forward and here are a couple that resonate with me. The heights of the buildings don't matter - they'll block no one's view. I'm also in favor of multi-family rentals especially if they are affordable. My kids would love to be able to afford to come back to Louisville to raise their kids but the housing prices are astronomical. This also goes for families of color who need/want affordable housing and want good schools for their kids too. Louisville should be more inviting and inclusive. Louisville would benefit from more diversity.

I'm a 20-year Louisville resident and spend as much of my money in Louisville as I can. Times are changing, Louisville needs to change with them. Multi-family dwellings and live/work spaces are the future.

Elizabeth Kaufman
783 Orchard Dr,
Louisville, CO 80027

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Redtail Ridge - Proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment and General Development Plan Amendment

From: Julia Knearl [<mailto:julia@juliaklaw.com>]

Sent: Thursday, June 25, 2020 10:38 AM

To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>

Cc: City Council <Council@louisvilleco.gov>

Subject: Redtail Ridge - Proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment and General Development Plan Amendment

To the Planning Commission:

As a long time resident of Louisville, I am writing today to strongly encourage the Planning Commission to vote “NO” on the above requested modifications to current City Plans. My concerns are:

1. The revisions do not align with either the Comprehensive Plan Vision Statement or our clearly articulated 14 Community Values. As such, there should be wide public support and process before any change of this size can be approved. That support has not been garnered in the community, and the public is largely unaware of the plan details that would have a huge impact on our community life. A variance from Community Values and the Comprehensive Plan this profound should be brought fully to light with an opportunity for widespread public debate by means of a referendum or other appropriate action to involve the citizenry. Particularly given the history of the parcel in question and its unique location in the City, this kind of decision, respectfully, should be beyond the purview of just the Planning Commission.
2. The traffic study makes it clear that the development will create a tremendous traffic increase in multiple areas that are already problematic or will become so in the coming years. The only proposed traffic improvements are to the intersections surrounding the development. I would strongly encourage the Planning Commission to consider the impacts that are not addressed by the developer’s proposal in any way. For example, 96th Street north from the development is expected to see a traffic increase of 15%. That corridor is already essentially at maximum capacity at various points during the week. How would the increase be addressed? What cost does this shift to the City and how does it impact plans for that corridor and amounts already invested by the City? Does the fact that 96th will see this increase drive more retail business away from Louisville and into Broomfield and Lafayette because of difficulty of access? How does further overburdening 96th Street impact our downtown and the businesses north of downtown.
3. The plan shows that the developer is moving very quickly to build residences and hotel space, but the retail is rolled out slowly. New residential building puts a strain on the City and those costs are evident in the economic analysis. What is also clear is that the developer wants to make as much money as possible as quickly as possible because that’s what residential build out does. The developer is not interested in retail development except to the extent that it is needed to convince the City that it *might* see enough revenue to offset the costs that the developer is going to create for the City. Please compare the developer’s investment in the relative build outs including both amounts and timing.
4. I am concerned that the consulting conclusions related to revenue for the City likely overstate the potential revenue for a variety of reasons. Without getting into all of them, the biggest problem with any consulting report of this type is that all of the consultant’s data must have been from the pre-Covid-19 era. There is no question that it was based on history that is no longer applicable to our current

environment. Obviously the pandemic does not mean that we all stop doing what we are doing and wait to see what unfolds. It does mean, however, that any positive picture of potential revenue must be seen in light of the huge qualifier that no one knows what retail spending, office building leasing or other similar economic activities will look like, particularly in the next few years. Moreover, to assume that property values will remain where they have been and that seniors will have income levels that they previously realized ignores the economic weight we are all facing. The only thing we know for a fact is that the City will see costs of some kind because roads will have to be maintained, the fire and police departments will have to be funded, and there will have to be City staff to maintain utilities and the basics of government, even if the economy is entering into a long downturn. Businesses will go away, but the City will remain in some form and will bear the costs.

For all of the above reasons, and many others, please vote "NO" on the proposed Amendments. This is not the right project for the City, and it is most certainly not the right time to take on something that would have such a large negative and costly impact on our community.

Thank you for your time and for your service to our City.

Best regards,

Julia

Julia M. Knearl, Esq.
Law Offices of Julia M. Knearl, L.L.C.
945 Front St.
Louisville, Colorado 80027
303.448.8899 (O)
303.817.3940 (C)
303.415.2500 (F)



CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This electronic message transmission, and any attachments, is intended only for use by the recipient and may contain legally privileged and/or confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient of this e-mail, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this e-mail, and any attachments thereto, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please immediately notify me at (303)448.8899, and permanently delete the original and any copy of the e-mail and any printout thereof. Thank you.

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Please vote no on the Redtail ridge development plan!

From: tamar krantz [<mailto:tamarkrantz@gmail.com>]

Sent: Thursday, June 25, 2020 8:29 AM

To: Planning <planning@Louisvilleco.gov>

Subject: Please vote no on the Redtail ridge development plan!

I see that you have a letter from BVSD that says that Monarch can accommodate new students that may come with new housing units at Red Tail ridge. This discussion has been behind closed doors and has not been discussed with parents of students who will be impacted by this decision.

The letter in your packet states that BVSD projects 108 new students will be going to Monarch K-8 from the 900 proposed apartments I do not know how many will be at the K-5 portion, but BVSD projects that K-5 will be at 100% capacity in 2021 to 2022 as a result of the development. Currently it is at about 90% with about 30% of students coming from open enrollment. The way to accommodate new students will be to close the schools to open enrollment and possibly move K-5 kids to middle school space. Monarch K8 currently hosts 200 students through open enrollment. BVSD has yet to answer many questions:

1. How will closing open enrollment affect diversity at the school?
2. Where will those open enrolled students go?
3. What will happen with siblings of kids currently open enrolled?
4. BVSD is making this calculation based on 900 apartments. Is there a chance that the developer will change their mind and put in other housing types that would change the calculation factor for students per household? If the school is at 100%, a change would be unacceptable.

During the town hall May 14, one of the Brue Baukol speakers said that BVSD is excited about the extension of campus drive. I am also hearing about problems that cancel those benefits .Dillon Road/S. 88th Street and S. 88th Street/Campus Drive intersections are expected to operate at a "F" level of service during the AM peak hour. There will be more public "cutting through" campus drive. I am imagining now ambulances passing both schools en route to the hospital.

20 years of construction will have air quality impacts (particulates) and noise impacts. Though the developer minimizes this in their presentations, this will affect learning and student health at both Monarch schools. Thank you for considering this. Tamar Krantz

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: I oppose the current proposal for development at Red Tail Ridge

From: Larry Lazar [<mailto:larrylazar@gmail.com>]

Sent: Thursday, June 25, 2020 9:22 AM

To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>

Subject: I oppose the current proposal for development at Red Tail Ridge

Dear Members of the Louisville Planning Commision,

I live and work in Louisville. I strongly oppose the proposed development at Red Tail Ridge which would require an amendment to our city's plan and strongly ask that you vote no. Please insist that the developer respect the characteristics that make this such a beautiful and desirable place to live and work and bring an alternate proposal that sustains and supports the community. In no way does the current proposal meet and of the criteria required to allow approval of a change to the comprehensive plan. A development of this size would drastically change our livable small town feel, overload our roads, public transportation system, and infrastructure of our town creating urban sprawl and effectively end any sense of community.

A smaller, more appropriate, proposal would allow increased tax base and revenue for the city rather than straining the budget. The current proposal does the opposite.

Boulder County does not support this proposal because of its size and all the regional traffic, housing, and environmental impacts it will create and it is contrary to the intent of the Northwest Parkway Intergovernmental Agreement.

Thank you for voting no on this proposal. Thank you for supporting responsible growth that supports our city plan rather than disrupts it.

Lawrence Lazar
462 W Spruce St.
Louisville, CO 80027

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Opposition to Red Tail Ridge development

From: Jacqueline Sant [<mailto:jn.sant@yahoo.com>]

Sent: Thursday, June 25, 2020 9:40 AM

To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>

Subject: Opposition to Red Tail Ridge development

I vehemently oppose the proposed development at Red Tail Ridge which would require an amendment to our city's plan and strongly ask that you vote no. Please insist that the developer respect the characteristics that make this such a beautiful and desirable place to live and work and bring an alternate proposal that sustains and supports the community. In no way does the current proposal meet any of the criteria required to allow approval of a change to the comprehensive plan. A development of this size would drastically change our livable small town feel, overload our roads, public transportation system, and infrastructure of our town creating urban sprawl and effectively end any sense of community.

A smaller, more appropriate, proposal would allow increased tax base and revenue for the city rather than straining the budget. The current proposal does the opposite.

Boulder County does not support this proposal because of its size and all the regional traffic, housing, and environmental impacts it will create and it is contrary to the intent of the Northwest Parkway Intergovernmental Agreement.

Thank you for voting no on this proposal. Thank you for supporting responsible growth that supports our city plan rather than disrupts it.

Jacqueline Sant
549 Adams Ave
Louisville

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: too big a plan

From: kelly [<mailto:mustharley@aol.com>]

Sent: Thursday, June 25, 2020 11:15 AM

To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>

Subject: too big a plan

HI please do not let the old storage tech be developed that big. 88th st is already overloaded.

Schedule public hearing when everyone can attend not over the zoom. It is way to hard for everyone to get to speak. Also let the whole town know about what is planned. They are only giving notice to people 1000 feet from the property so that leaves out most of the town being given notice. It is not fair to everyone if they can not have any say in the matter.

Have more open space and less building.

Thank You
Kelly Macaulay
1950 Shamrock Drive
Superior Co 80027

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Redtail Ridge Comprehensive Plan Amendment and General Development Plan Amendment:

-----Original Message-----

From: Jane Massie [mailto:sjanemassie@me.com]

Sent: Thursday, June 25, 2020 11:33 AM

To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>

Cc: Ashley Stolzmann <ashleys@louisvilleco.gov>; Dennis Maloney <DennisM@louisvilleco.gov>; Kyle Brown <kbrown@louisvilleco.gov>

Subject: Redtail Ridge Comprehensive Plan Amendment and General Development Plan Amendment:

Hello,

I am writing to state my concern regarding the Redtail Ridge Development Plan.

I moved to Louisville in Fall 1983 with my husband and 9 month old baby. We moved into Heritage II, a new development, a new house, with one access road into Old Town, Cherry Street. There were no buses except downtown. No recreation center. But there was a city pool, city parks, and best of all - a library. And lots of new families with kids.

Maybe Old Town residents felt like we do now, that a new development was going to take away their quality of life. But that didn't happen. Because we were all part of Louisville. A company was not in control of Heritage homes. We paid the same taxes to Louisville. We received the same services. We had an equal voice in city elections. We raised money together for a new Library, a police station, a recreation center.

Why is consideration of this development being moved so fast?

What citizen committees have been formed for wider discussion?

I cherish the concept of a Consensus of Citizens. I do not want a few with links to power to direct the course of our city. I want our citizens to profit, not outside developers.

Louisville has made efforts to be inclusive, to take into account not only citizen needs, but also business, environment, regional needs.

The area can be developed under current guidelines. We would benefit from connecting roads. We want to embrace the area into Louisville, with similar tax base. Whose residents participate fully in Louisville. Current Louisville residents need a bigger voice in this decision.

Please do not pass this change.

Jane Massie

178 S. Buchanan Ave.

Rob Zuccaro

To: d
Subject: FW: Redtail Ridge - procedural complaint

From: Jason Mastrine [<mailto:mastrine@gmail.com>]
Sent: Thursday, June 25, 2020 1:25 PM
To: Planning <planning@Louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Redtail Ridge - procedural complaint

Planning Commission:

I live at 197 N Hoover Ave, Louisville, CO 80027. I am writing to formally issue a complaint regarding the review and approval process for Redtail Ridge. Whatever decision you ultimately conclude, I think it's important that big decisions who's consequences will last for generations, requires sufficient in-person public process. That can't happen right now.

Please delay a vote on this important decision until we are collectively able to meet in person.

Regards,

Jason Mastrine (new Louisville homeowner)
197 Hoover Ave
Louisville CO 80027

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Redtail Ridge

-----Original Message-----

From: Jennifer Kirk [mailto:jenniferjkirk@comcast.net]
Sent: Thursday, June 25, 2020 9:40 AM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Redtail Ridge

Planning Commission,

As a Louisville resident and business owner, I urge you to vote against the current development plans for Redtail Ridge. The density of this project is too high for this area and will have a detrimental effect on our small town, especially through increased traffic and overcrowded schools. Also, the environmental impact of this project is too great. We must be good stewards of the environment to protect the beautiful Colorado lands and drew us here. I strongly oppose this project as it is proposed and urge you to reject the current plans.

Jennifer Kirk

Sent from my iPad

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Redtail Ridge - Citizen Feedback

From: Brian Moran [<mailto:bmoran@ghx.com>]
Sent: Thursday, June 25, 2020 9:02 AM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Redtail Ridge - Citizen Feedback

Hello,

I understand that this evening a decision will be delivered regarding the development of Redtail Ridge, the former StorageTek site. I am concerned about the current proposal as it stands. While I support development of the site, the proposal is ***far too large***. Please ask the developer to revisit the plan and come back with a plan that is similar in size to the ConocoPhillips proposal & meets the criteria in the current Comprehensive Development Plan.

> Please vote NO on the development plan and vote no to allow changes to the current Comprehensive Plan.

Louisville does not need 900 more multi-family rental units. This number is WAY out of line.

A good deal of effort and money went into creating the Comprehensive Plan and it seems short-sighted to not stand by the plan & its stated values. The proposal will result in huge impacts to our town including stress on our infrastructure & a significant change of character to our community, not to mention environmental impact. I understand the proposal also does not have the support of Boulder County. Louisville has a unique nature and adding this oversized development on the border will drastically change it, essentially adding urban sprawl & congestion along US36 and removing any boundary with the surrounding community.

Thanks for your attention,
Brian Moran
589 W Arrowhead St., Louisville CO 80027

Rob Zuccaro

To: d
Subject: FW: Redtail Ridge comments

From: Trudi Moran [<mailto:trudirmoran@gmail.com>]
Sent: Thursday, June 25, 2020 8:40 AM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Redtail Ridge comments

Hello there,

I understand that this evening a decision will be delivered regarding the development of Redtail Ridge, the former StorageTek site. I am concerned about the current proposal as it stands. While I support development of the site, the proposal is *far too large*. Please ask the developer to revisit the plan and come back with a plan that is similar in size to the ConocoPhillips proposal & meets the criteria in the current Comprehensive Development Plan.

> Please vote NO on the development plan and vote no to allow changes to the current Comprehensive Plan.

Louisville does not need 900 more multi-family rental units. This number is WAY out of line.

A good deal of effort and money went into creating the Comprehensive Plan and it seems short-sighted to not stand by the plan & its stated values. The proposal will result in huge impacts to our town including stress on our infrastructure & a significant change of character to our community, not to mention environmental impact. I understand the proposal also does not have the support of Boulder County. Louisville has a unique nature and adding this oversized development on the border will drastically change it, essentially adding urban sprawl & congestion along US36 and removing any boundary with the surrounding community.

Thanks for your attention,
Trudi Redd Moran
589 W Arrowhead St., Louisville CO 80027

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Redtail Ridge development decision

From: Christine Nimmo [<mailto:christinenimmo773@gmail.com>]
Sent: Thursday, June 25, 2020 9:50 AM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Redtail Ridge development decision

Please do not accept the proposed plan now under consideration on multiple grounds including it will make Louisville subject to urban sprawl -- antithetical to the basic nature of our town.

The proposal is too big. A more acceptable plan would keep development to the size approved for Conoco Phillips and no larger.

Any plan that should deserve consideration should meet all four criteria listed in Sec.17.64.070. This current plan meets none of these criteria.

Finally, Louisville does not need 900 more rental units in part because it will result in a loss of tax generated income for the city.

Christine Nimmo
397 Caledonia Street
Louisville, CO

--

Dr. Christine Nimmo
christinenimmo773@gmail.com

Dr. Ross Holland
rossholland027@gmail.com

397 Caledonia Street
Louisville, CO 80027 USA

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Redtail Ridge Overdevelopment Proposal
Attachments: Louisville Planning Commission.docx

From: Michelle Reddy [mailto:Michelle_Reddy@comcast.net]
Sent: Thursday, June 25, 2020 8:17 AM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>
Cc: Matt Jones <electmattjones@gmail.com>
Subject: Redtail Ridge Overdevelopment Proposal

Louisville Planning Commission:

In regards to the proposed Redtail Ridge overdevelopment proposal, JUST SAY NO. It is too large, too invasive, and destroys forever the precious wild greenspace that creates a buffer between Broomfield, Superior, and Louisville. Already, Louisville has lost or is losing much of its greenspace. With the change in retail habits of consumers, malls such as FlatIrons Mall will be a thing of the past, and it makes much more sense to reuse and redevelop these areas into the type of development proposed by Redtail Ridge. These areas cannot be returned to the wild habitat and native greenspace that Redtail Ridge threatens to destroy. There are already plans in place to create much of the type of development proposed by Redtail Ridge in the FlatIrons mall property, which is a brilliant reuse of malls as they become abandoned in this era of online shopping <https://www.broomfieldenterprise.com/2020/05/11/nordstrom-closure-a-step-toward-mixed-used-redevelopment-at-flatiron-crossing/>. Duplicative development will oversaturate the area. In addition, we already have an industrial park for places like Medtronic if they need to expand from their current location in Louisville.

Please, please, protect us and the small town feel of our great town that continues to rate as one of the best places to live in the United States. Don't let anyone steal this from us. Redtail Ridge will not serve Louisville; it is designed to serve the pockets of the developers. Defend us from this outrageous **OVER**development proposal at the Storage Tek site. If it requires a large PR firm to try to slip this past you, it is obviously not the right thing to do. As is, the proposal is not compatible with the design of Louisville and will bring traffic congestion, create pollution, pressure on housing, remove important open space, and obliterate community separation from Broomfield. It will be the death knell of our cherished town and forever and irrevocably change who we are for the worst. We are relying on you to:

- 1) **Tell the developer their proposal is way, way too big.** If we are even going to consider this proposal, have them reduce it to what was approved for ConocoPhillips **AT THE MOST**, which was already a generous 60% bigger than Storage Tek. Vote **NO** on the development plan and PUD currently on the agenda.
- 2) **WAIT to schedule the public hearing** on the biggest, most severe Louisville land use and development decision in decades. Don't let them slip it by while we are staying home because of the pandemic. Wait until it is **safe to have an in-person hearing** that is open to all and well-advertised.

I beg you....Louisville is a special place, and while it is important to move forward, our development must be smart and ensure that it is in line with who and where we are. Let's not rape our limited, precious space with

short-sighted ambition and sell out our families to a greedy developer who does not care about us. We trust you will protect us and see beyond the PR hype...if it were so good for us, a PR firm would not be required. Louisville still belongs to us, and we need you to keep it that way. Make them do it **OUR** way or send them on **THEIR** way.

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Redtail Ridge - too big

From: Peter Ruprecht [<mailto:pruprecht@gmail.com>]

Sent: Thursday, June 25, 2020 11:51 AM

To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>

Subject: Redtail Ridge - too big

Dear Louisville Planning Commission,

It's great that a big company wants to put a new headquarters on the old StorageTek site, but I'm very concerned that all of the additional housing, etc, that's part of the current development proposal will cause significant traffic problems in that area.

Although I live in Superior, I feel that this development would definitely affect me in two ways: First, my kids go to school at Monarch and there's already traffic mayhem in that area every morning and afternoon. I can't possibly see how it would be possible to avoid terrible congestion if all of those new residences are allowed at Redtail Ridge. Second, one of the main accesses to that part of Louisville is along 88th St in Superior, which is also already heavily overused at some times of the day.

Thanks,
Peter Ruprecht
185 Mohawk Cir
Superior, CO 80027

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Red Tail Ridge Project

From: Dominick Saia [<mailto:nicksaia@msn.com>]
Sent: Thursday, June 25, 2020 10:37 AM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Red Tail Ridge Project

Dear Planning Commission,

I am a 15-year Louisville resident at 263 Hoover Avenue and a business owner on Main Street in Louisville for the last seven years. I oppose the Red Tail Ridge project in its current form. I fear that the proposed development is much larger than what has been envisioned in the past for this site.

The project in its current form will only further burden the City's already strained infrastructure and exacerbate the crowding we already see, resulting in a further degradation of the quality of life in the place that my family and friends call home. I do not believe there has been sufficient study of the impacts of such a behemoth development, both in the City of Louisville and regionally. I fear that due to the pandemic there has not been sufficient time for input from the public and other stakeholders in this process.

This is the development of the last major parcel in Louisville. The parcel has been sitting vacant for years. The Planning Commission has a duty not to rush this process and to approve a plan for development at this site in a manner which compliments our City and preserves natural habitat.

Thanks for your consideration.

Nick
Dominick M. Saia
Attorney at Law
Law Offices of Dominick M. Saia, L.L.C.
1400 Main Street, Suite 200
Louisville, Colorado 80027
Telephone: (303) 665-0230
E-Mail: nicksaia@msn.com
Website: www.nicksaialaw.com

The information transmitted (including attachments) is covered by the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 U.S.C. 2510-2521, is intended only for the person(s) or entity/entities to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon, this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient(s) is prohibited. If you received this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from any computer.

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Opposition to Red Tail Ridge development

From: Jacqueline Sant [<mailto:jn.sant@yahoo.com>]

Sent: Thursday, June 25, 2020 9:40 AM

To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>

Subject: Opposition to Red Tail Ridge development

I vehemently oppose the proposed development at Red Tail Ridge which would require an amendment to our city's plan and strongly ask that you vote no. Please insist that the developer respect the characteristics that make this such a beautiful and desirable place to live and work and bring an alternate proposal that sustains and supports the community. In no way does the current proposal meet any of the criteria required to allow approval of a change to the comprehensive plan. A development of this size would drastically change our livable small town feel, overload our roads, public transportation system, and infrastructure of our town creating urban sprawl and effectively end any sense of community.

A smaller, more appropriate, proposal would allow increased tax base and revenue for the city rather than straining the budget. The current proposal does the opposite.

Boulder County does not support this proposal because of its size and all the regional traffic, housing, and environmental impacts it will create and it is contrary to the intent of the Northwest Parkway Intergovernmental Agreement.

Thank you for voting no on this proposal. Thank you for supporting responsible growth that supports our city plan rather than disrupts it.

Jacqueline Sant
549 Adams Ave
Louisville

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Redtail Ridge developement

From: Bev Snyder [<mailto:bev@wisegator.com>]
Sent: Thursday, June 25, 2020 10:38 AM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Redtail Ridge developement

Good morning,

I am so concerned about this proposed develeopement this is the second letter I am/have written to you all.

The scope of this project is JUST TOOOOOO BIG.

Our area cannot handle such a surge in traffic, water needs, sewer, etc. We cannot and do not want such large buildings looming over the highway and the surrounding area.

Again, we feel the Planning Commission MUST hold the developer responsible for all of the criteria - this does not happen with the current plan as we read it.

Louisville DOES NOT NEED another 900 housing units.

Please consider the detrimental changes this idea will bring to our area and tell the developer to go back to the drawing board and DOWN size this request. Considerably down size.

Thank you for your attention.

Bev Snyder and Rolland Fearn
304 Diamond Cir
Louisville 80027

303 666 8167

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Retail Ridge Development

-----Original Message-----

From: Justin Solomon [mailto:jsolly90@gmail.com]

Sent: Thursday, June 25, 2020 10:55 AM

To: City Council <Council@louisvilleco.gov>

Subject: Retail Ridge Development

Dear City Council Members,

I am writing in opposition to the GDP Amendment for the proposed Redtail Ridge Development. While I'm in favor of a corporate campus at this location, as permitted by the current development plan, I am opposed to expanding/amending the development plan to allow residential and retail development. Additional retail and residential development are not needed and will do nothing to improve the quality of life for the citizens of Louisville. To the contrary, residential development is a net tax dollar drain and the city has numerous retail locations (approved lots and built out) that currently sit vacant. Worsening traffic flows in the area is also not enhancing the quality of life for existing residents. Should the city allow developers to profit while building out more residential and increase the city's tax burden with no guarantee that the commercial and retail spaces will ever be built or occupied or recourse if they're not? Should we be approving new commercial and retail space when Kohl's and Sam's Club sit vacant, half the DeLo strip mall is empty and the North End retail strip remains vacant lots?

Growth for growth's sake is not progress. This is the last large undeveloped track of land left in Louisville. Few residents are clamoring for more development in the city. Every elected official in the city cites preserving Louisville's small town character when seeking our votes. Approving this amendment and allowing additional development not currently permitted runs counter to our small town character and further blurs our border with Broomfield's encroachment. If the planning commission and city council are serious about maintaining Louisville's small town character and creating a sustainable tax base, the city will limit the development to the current plan that will bring a tax generating corporate complex to the site and not approve residential development that is a tax drain and retail space that is not needed and may never materialize. With so little land left for development, preserving available open space should be the priority and future generations of Louisvillians will recognize and thank us for our foresight and wisdom.

Sincerely,

Justin Solomon
477 Lincoln Ct

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Traffic Study on RedTail Ridge—Very Important Information

-----Original Message-----

From: sherry sommer [mailto:helloscherry2@yahoo.com]

Sent: Thursday, June 25, 2020 1:10 PM

To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>

Subject: Traffic Study on RedTail Ridge—Very Important Information

Dear Members of the Planning Commission,

You need to be aware of some very important observations made by residents during the recent Superior Town Board meeting discussing the Zaharias rezoning proposal.

What we heard was so outrageous that I would doubt myself as an accurate witness except for the fact that it was corroborated by other witnesses, including a Superior resident who works for CDOT.

An individual spoke regarding the traffic study—He said he had been employed in this line of work for 30 years and that he was doing the Traffic Studies for both Zaharias and RedTail Ridge.

While explaining his methodology, he said he had made ONE DAY of traffic studies along 88th in order to determine a baseline. That was during December 2019, and I believe it was December 19. That was simply not enough data, and I believe the study was done on a day that traffic was low because school was not even in session.

The other issue that really concerned me was that he stated that Louisville would be used for some cut through traffic resulting from the new development at Zaharias. Is this assumption included in our traffic study?

I'm wondering:

- 1) Are we getting a traffic study based on adequate data? How many days were studied to obtain our baseline?
- 2) Does our traffic study include data for cumulative effects of new developments?
- 3) If indeed the Zaharias study is based on too little data, is it even possible that a study of cumulative traffic could be accurate?
- 4) The traffic study done for RedTail Ridge, a document of over 200 pages without an accurate and concise synopsis is not acceptable. We need a study that is accessible to residents who are interested in understanding the implications of this project.
- 5) The current traffic study for RedTail has determined that several items have received low if not failing grades. It is unacceptable that a development that will have a significant impact on traffic congestion and air quality be approved.

Please vote no on this zoning change.

Sincerely

Sherry Sommer
910 South Palisade Court
Louisville

Sent from my iPhone

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: RedTail Ridge

-----Original Message-----

From: sherry sommer [mailto:helloscherry2@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, June 25, 2020 8:26 AM
To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: RedTail Ridge

Dear Members of the Planning Commission,

As you meet again to discuss the rezoning and development proposal for RedTail Ridge, I would like to urge you again to vote NO. I am writing with new information for you to consider. I am also adding some of the public comment I gave last meeting so it is part of the written record.

I would also like to make it clearly know that I am not simply a NIMBY or naysayer, names that developers like to use to brand and dismiss members of the public who don't fall into line with their plans.

I would strongly support Medtronic's development under current zoning, and would be especially in support if it was possible to acquire Open Space on the site as well.

You must be aware that the overwhelming majority, if not all of comments in favor of this proposal, have been made by individuals who have a personal interest in seeing it go forward.

At your last meeting, public comment came from the CEOs of Medtronic and Avista, David Sinkey, who is a developer with Boulder Creek, and several Medtronic employees.

Carlos Hernandez also testified strongly in favor. I don't know what his connection to Brue Baukal is, but I do know that he was a small group leader at the first Open House they hosted. Is he employed by the developer? Perhaps. He was hired early this year by the City of Boulder as Transportation Director and left that position shortly afterwards. While he (creepily) looked up personal information of those testifying against in public comments, dismissing us as irrelevant middle aged white homeowners, it looks like he himself has some personal disclosure to do.

Since the meeting more letters from Medtronic employees in favor have poured in.

It is required by law that Members of the Planning Commission disclose any conflict of interest on decisions they are part of. While this is not a requirement among members of the public, we need to keep in mind that people who are making comments may have strong interests in the project because it benefits them personally. That should be taken into account in your decision making.

All public comment against was made by members of the public and two well respected public servants, Matt Brown and Bob Muckle. Some of the residents who were opposed live close to the development, others live farther away. None of them saw the public benefit the developer says will result from this project.

What I find absolutely astounding and telling is the developer, aided by a sophisticated team, has had numerous opportunities for public outreach, and all of the outreach has been on their terms. They have been promoting the supposed public benefit, and yet even after all that outreach, the public is appalled by the size and density of this

project. Residents are intelligent. If this really was in our interest we could see that and support this development as proposed.

We can see through the misleading ways this project has been framed—they compare its FAR to monstrous developments like Superior Town Center and Arista and it comes out looking a little less bad than it is. They propose that traffic from Senior Living will not affect rush hour traffic-but don't state the obvious, that overall traffic will increase. The list goes on and on. There is nothing honest or transparent about the way this is being presented.

I attended the very first open house hosted by the developer and at that time, they promised there would be no residential development at the site, there would be plenty of Open Space accessible to the public, and that wildlife would be preserved. They said traffic congestion would become better and not worse.

There is a such a disconnect between this vision and what we are seeing today. This developer is not new to this process. That they would state that they could go forward with this project without residential and with great public benefit seems like either deliberate deception or complete lack of understanding of what is possible. Now they are firmly saying that this development must be accepted as planned if they are to go forward. Something is not right here.

None of this bodes well for Louisville. Please vote no and stop this unnecessary stress on the public during this already very trying time.

Sincerely,

Sherry Sommer
910 South Palisade Court
Louisville

Sent from my iPhone

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Red tail Ridge

-----Original Message-----

From: David Walters [mailto:padlw@aol.com]

Sent: Thursday, June 25, 2020 7:16 AM

To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>

Subject: Red tail Ridge

GM

I am sure residents cannot not stop this developing BUT how about being more reasonable, I.e., 3 story buildings not 5, lot more open space, lower income housing

Thanks

David Walters

Louisville

Sent from my iPhone

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: Redtail Ridge

-----Original Message-----

From: Sarah Weaver [mailto:sweaver79@comcast.net]

Sent: Thursday, June 25, 2020 11:26 AM

To: Planning Commission <PlanningCommission@louisvilleco.gov>

Subject: Redtail Ridge

To Whom It May Concern

As a lifelong Colorado resident and current Louisville citizen, I am writing about my concerns over the proposed Redtail Ridge development.

The scale and size is way too large for our community. While I am not opposed to some development of the site, the current proposal is well above anything that would keep our small-town feel sustainable. Adding 25% more residential units will place a strain on our already limited resources and infrastructure. I am concerned about the impact on our school, roads, and environment.

With Superior adding a large complex west of US 36, I am concerned about the traffic impacts on school and hospital accessibility. As it currently stands, students, staff, and parents already face significant traffic to get to Monarch and Avista in the mornings with long delays and backups on Dillon Road as well as 88th. Adding a development of the proposed scale will only worsen these problems and require additional road expansion to alleviate congestion.

In Louisville we are blessed with an abundance of wildlife. The addition of this enormous development will destroy wildlife habitats and drive out our beloved coyotes, hawks, owls, snakes, and all other wild creatures who live and mingle out here on the outskirts of our community.

I have read communication from Boulder County Commissioner Matt Jones who is also in opposition, and as a citizen I stand with his assessment.

I am asking that the committee take the following steps

1) Tell the developer that their proposal is way, way too big. The developer should come back with a plan the size of what was approved for ConocoPhillips, which is already a generous 60% bigger than Storage Tek, and to vote no on the development plan and PUD on the agenda.

2) Vote that the developer does not meet the criteria for a comprehensive plan change. The developer must meet every one of the four criteria (listed below) for the Planning Commission to be able to vote yes. I do not see how these criteria are even close to being met. The developer can already build up to three million square feet under the current "Rural" designation, so a comprehensive plan change is not needed. That's twice the size of StorageTek and much bigger than Conoco Phillips 2.4 million square feet. Medtronic can easily fit into that space with lots of room left over for office and retail.

3) Understand that Louisville does not need 900 more multi-family rental units which are essentially out of town, will increase rental units to about 45% of Louisville's housing stock and will make the city actually lose tax base.

Thank you for listening. While some growth and change is inevitable, Redtail Ridge as it is currently proposed is not the kind of urban sprawl growth that Louisville needs right now.

Sincerely,
Sarah Weaver

Comprehensive plan change requirements

“Sec. 17.64.070. - Criteria for amendment.

Before an amendment to the comprehensive plan may be adopted, it must be demonstrated that each of the following criteria have been met or are not applicable in order to approve the amendment:

- A. The amendment request is consistent with the goals, policies and intent of the comprehensive plan of the city; (See below for some comprehensive plan values.)
- B. The amendment request will not result in adverse impacts to existing or planned services to the citizens of the city;
- C. The amendment request demonstrates a need exists for the amendment through either changed conditions or past error which support adjustments to the city's comprehensive plan;
- D. The planning commission and/or city council may consider other factors in reviewing an application as they deem appropriate and may request additional information which is necessary for an adequate review and evaluation of the amendment.” (“Other factors” can include public opinion.)

Here are some of the comprehensive plan “values” that show “intent” related to criterion A. above:

- “A Sense of Community . . . where residents, property owners, business owners, and visitors feel a connection to Louisville and to each other, and where the City’s character, physical form and accessible government contribute to a citizenry that is actively involved in the decision-making process to meet their individual and collective needs.
- Our Livable Small Town Feel . . . where the City’s size, scale, and land use mixture and government’s high-quality customer service encourage personal and commercial interactions. A Healthy, Vibrant, and Sustainable Economy . . . where the City understands and appreciates the trust our residents, property owners, and business owners place in it when they invest in Louisville, and where the City is committed to a strong and supportive business climate which fosters a healthy and vibrant local and regional economy for today and for the future.
- Sustainable Practices for the Economy, Community, and the Environment . . . where we challenge our government, residents, property owners, and our business owners to be innovative with sustainable practices so the needs of today are met without compromising the needs of future generations. Unique
- Balanced Transportation System . . . where the City desires to make motorists, transit customers, bicyclists and pedestrians of all ages and abilities partners in mobility, and where the City intends to create and maintain a multimodal transportation system to ensure that each user can move in ways that contribute to the economic prosperity, public health, and exceptional quality of life in the City.
- Integrated Open Space and Trail Networks . . . where the City appreciates, manages and preserves the natural environment for community benefit, including its ecological diversity, its outstanding views, clear-cut boundaries, and the interconnected, integrated trail network which makes all parts of the City accessible.

- Ecological Diversity . . . where the City, through its management of parks and open space and its development and landscape regulations, promotes biodiversity by ensuring a healthy and resilient natural environment, robust plant life and diverse habitats.
- Open, Efficient and Fiscally Responsible Government . . . where the City government is approachable, transparent, and ethical,

Sent from my iPhone

Rob Zuccaro

Subject: FW: RedTail Ridge Comments

From: Mike Williams [<mailto:mwilly@comcast.net>]

Sent: Thursday, June 25, 2020 2:36 PM

To: Planning <planning@Louisvilleco.gov>

Subject: RedTail Ridge Comments

Hello Planning Commission,

I am a 25 year resident of Louisville, who works from home, therefore I spend a lot of time here. I have seen the property sit vacant for many years with the hope there will someday be a sensible use of the property.

I have been learning more about the RedTail Ridge development recently and am pretty impressed with the well balanced approach that the developers are taking. I look forward to the expansion and growth of Louisville in a positive way as well as wonderful trails for bikes, hikers and walkers alike.

I hope that you will consider approving their plan, as it would be a welcome economic addition to the City of Louisville.

Thanks,

Michael Williams
2351 Senator Court